

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:	)	
	:	Examiner: George C. Neurauter
Taco van IEPEREN	)	
	:	Group Art Unit: 2143
Application No.: 09/966,733	)	
	:	Confirmation No.: 3598
Filed: October 1, 2001	)	
	:	
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR	)	April 28, 2006
CREATING AND MANAGING	:	
SECURE SHARED WORKSPACES	)	

**MAIL STOP FEE AMENDMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE AND PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

Sir:

Applicant petitions to extend the time for response to the December 28, 2005

Office Action to April 28, 2006. Please charge Deposit Account 50-1710 \$120.00 for payment of the extension fee. Any additional fee required, and any overpayments should also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1710.

In response to the December 28, 2005 Office Action, please enter the following:

**I. Remarks** begin at page 2 of this paper.

## **I. Remarks**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1- 18 and 21-29 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 15, and 21 are independent.

In response to the Examiner's request for information under 37 CFR 1.105, Applicant respectfully traverses this requirement insofar as it requests information beyond the only possible basis for rejection under 35 USC 102, i.e., whether the invention was in "public use" prior to October, 1, 2000<sup>1</sup>. (See MPEP 704.14). In response to the requirement, Applicant states that (after investigation) no such information has been uncovered. In particular, Applicant has uncovered no information regarding the submission of any document or any other information disclosing the present invention to Chris Schmandt or any other member of the CSCW 2000 conference staff prior to October, 1, 2000.

Claims 1-18 and 21-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being allegedly being known by another in this country before the invention thereof, as discussed at page 6 of the office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As Applicant has asserted a date of invention prior to January 4, 2000 (as acknowledged by the Examiner), there is no evidence in the case which would lead to the conclusion that the subject invention was known by Chris Schmandt or any other member of the public, in the United States, prior to January 4, 2000.

In view of the above, it is believed the application is in order for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested.

In view of the extended prosecution in this case, any telephone inquiry from the Examiner to the undersigned would be welcomed. (202) 625-3507.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant believes that the Examiner is confused as to the different bases for rejection under 35 USC 102. A rejection under 35 USC 102(a) "known...by others in this country...before the invention thereof" is clearly inappropriate for the reasons discussed above. The prior rejections under 35 USC 102(b) "public use" or "on sale" were inappropriate for the reasons enumerated in the November 29, 2005 Response. Nevertheless, Applicant is responding to this requirement as forthrightly as possible.

Applicant's attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 625-3507. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard P. Bauer/  
Attorney for Applicant  
Richard P. Bauer  
Registration No. 31,588

Patent Administrator  
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN L.L.P.  
525 West Monroe Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60611-3693  
Facsimile: (312) 902-1061